REMARKS

Claims 1-3, 5-24, 26-28, 50-51 and 53-68 are pending in the present application. Claims 1, 11, 14, 19, 22, 26, 50, and 51 have been amended in addition to the amendments presented in the response to which this document is a supplement. Therefore, considering all the amendments, claims 1, 11, 14, 19, 22, 26, 50, 51, 65, 67 and 68 are amended in response to the Office Action issued on August 3, 2010.

The additional amendments to claims 1, 11, 14, 19, 22, 26, 50, and 51 find support in at least paragraph [0034] of the application publication and are intended to clarify the language for the Examiner that when the second private key is output (e.g., from the mobile user device), that second private key is no longer stored on the device from which it is output.

Examiner Interview

Applicants thank the Examiner and her Supervisor for the interview on November 17, 2010. During that interview, Applicants repeated and laid out the arguments set forth in the response filed November 3, 2010. In particular, that neither Arthan et al. nor Sudia teaches or suggests a second private key being output from the mobile user device while retaining the first private key. During the interview it became apparent that it would be helpful to clarify the claim language to indicate that the second private key is deleted from the device when it is output from the device, as has been previously argued. The Examiner's supervisor admitted during the interview that outputting the second private key such that it is not stored on the device from which it is output would overcome the cited references.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-10, 14-18, 22-24, 50 and 53-56

Applicants repeat the arguments set forth in the response filed November 3, 2010, that Arthan et al. and Sudia fail to teach or suggest outputting the second private key, and more specifically "outputting the second private key such that it is not stored on the mobile user device while retaining the first private key in the mobile user device," as recited in claim 1 and as similarly recited in claims 14, 22 and 50.

Claims 11-13, 19-21, 26-28 and 51

Applicants repeat the arguments set forth in the response filed November 3, 2010, that Arthan et al. and Sudia fail to teach or suggest a second public key that has a corresponding second private key, which is split into a plurality of shares that are sent to a plurality of different entities and, more specifically, "that is split into a plurality of shares that are sent to a plurality of different entities such that it is not stored on the mobile user device," as recited in claim 11 and as similarly recited in claims 19 and 26.

Claims 57-68

No additional changes have been made to claims 57-68, and Applicants repeat the arguments set forth in the response filed November 3, 2010 with respect to these claims.

CONCLUSION

Applicant submits that the application is in condition for allowance, for which early action is requested. Please charge any fees or overpayments that may be due with this response to Deposit Account No. 17-0026.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: November 19, 2010   By: /Won Tae C. Kim/
                                                    Won Tae C. Kim, Reg. # 40,457

QUALCOMM Incorporated
5775 Morehouse Drive
San Diego, California 92121
Telephone: (858) 658-2752